

**REMARKS**

The rejection of Claims 1, 5 and 19 on grounds of obviousness-type double patenting is respectively traversed, and reconsideration is request in view of the foregoing amendments in which, inter alia, Claim 1 has been canceled and Claim 15 and 19 are dependent on Claim 3.

Likewise, the rejections of Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 14-19 as being anticipated by Nagasaka et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), of Claims 5 and 10-13 as being unpatentable over Nagasaka et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), of Claims 8 and 9 as being unpatentable over Nagasaka et al. in view of Chou et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and of Claim 20 as being unpatentable over Nagaskau et al. in view of Asai et al. also under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are each respectfully traversed. Reconsideration is similarly requested based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim 3 has now been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 5 as well as the features described at page 7, lines 21 *et seq.* of the disclosure.

Initially, Applicants take issue with the statement in the Office Action that the Nagasaka et al. patent teaches a relative scan of the target to be identified. In reviewing col. 4, lines 4-27 of that patent, Applicants find no such

teaching. To the extent that the Office continues with this assertion, it is requested to point out more specifically where the relative scan feature based upon relative displacement information is referenced.

None of the cited references suggest a personal identification device that detects a blood vessel pattern using an aligned image sensor in a transmission-type device wherein a perpendicular relative scan is employed. Nagasaka et al.'s apparatus is clearly not so constructed to operate and would not suggest modification to so operate. Certainly no such contention can be made with respect to the Chou et al and/or Asai et al. secondary citations.

Accordingly, early and favorable action is now earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.


If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

Serial No. 10/563,962  
Amendment Dated: April 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action Mailed: November 26, 2007  
Attorney Docket No. 056205.57280US

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit  
Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056205.57280US).

April 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James F. McKeown  
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JFM:slw

5585876\_1.DOC